



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,095	03/16/2001	Akinori Ohnishi	1035-311	8949

23117 7590 04/06/2005

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
1100 N GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/809,095	Applicant(s) OHNISHI, AKINORI	
	Examiner Peng Ke	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/17/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 9/17/2004.

Claims 1 – 25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 24 and 25 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed in 9/17/04 claims 1, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, and 24-25 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271.

As per claim 1, Morris et al. teach an operation method for processing data file, comprising the steps of:

(a) displaying for each of one or more data files a reduced-size image/file icon pair wherein the reduced-size image is for use in identifying the contents of the data file and the

Art Unit: 2174

corresponding file icon is spaced from the reduced-size image, and has a smaller area (see Morris et al., figure 12B, items 809 and 807, column 6, lines 19 – 33, and column 15, lines 33 – 44; the examiner interprets the icons displayed in the thumbnail display as file icons and the scaled image as the reduced-size image); and

(b) performing at least either one of the operations of i) selecting a function to be applied to the data file and ii) changing a display position of the reduced-size image by a drag-and-drop operation on the file icon (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 67, and column 14, lines 1 – 11).

However Morris fails to teach displaying the icon concurrently with the reduced image wherein the display position of the file icon relative to the display position of the reduced-size image is predetermined to be the same for each of the reduced-size image/file icon pairs;

Savitzky et al. teaches displaying the icon concurrently with the reduced image wherein the display position of the file icon relative to the display position of the reduced-size image is predetermined to be the same for each of the reduced-size image/file icon pairs (see Savitzky figure 3, items 306 and 308, column 3, lines 10-20; Examiner interprets a caption to be a icon because a user can click on one of the captions to perform an action) ;

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Savitzky's teaching with the method of Morris in order to simplify presentation and selection of images over the web.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Morris et al. further teach the method wherein:

Art Unit: 2174

in step (b), when the file icon is dropped at a position where no function icon representing a kind of a function to be applied to the data file is displayed, a display position of the corresponding reduced-size image is changed by moving the corresponding reduced-size image to a position at a predetermined interval from a dropped position of the file icon (see Morris et al, column 6, lines 37 – 67 and column 14, lines 1 – 11; it is inherent that there is no function icon when the thumbnail file icon is moved to a new position by a drag-and-drop operation, and when the icon is moved, the display position for the reduced-size image is changed to correspond to the changed position of the thumbnail file icon).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 3 (see rejection above). Morris et al. further teach the method wherein:

the reduced-file image is displayed in an area on the opposite side of a moving region of the file icon where the file icon is moved to a display position of a function icon (see Morris et al., figure 12b, items 804, 807 and 809, column 13, lines 37 – 67 and column 14, lines 1 – 11; the examiner interprets item 804 to be function icons, and item 807 as the moving region where the thumbnail file icon can be moved to).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Morris et al. further teach the operation method for processing data files as set forth in claim 1, wherein:

the file icon is displayed at positions in proximity of the reduced-size image (see Morris et al., figure 12b, items 809 and 807).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 in view of Johnston, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,598,524 and Belfiore et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,611,060.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Morris et al. further teach the method wherein:

in the step (b), the reduced-size image is fixed at a current position while a drag operation on the file icon is being performed (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 67, and column 14, lines 1 – 11).

Morris et al. teach indicating a drag operation by a visual change (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 62). They do not teach indicating a drag operation by displaying a frame having the size of the reduced size image. Johnston, Jr. et al. teach displaying a frame having the size of a display object as it is dragged (see Johnston, Jr. et al., figures 13a, items 1300 and 1310 and column 13, lines 25 – 33).

Morris et al. teach performing an action when a threshold is breached during a drag operation (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 62; the display order is changed when the thumbnail is dragged onto a different part of the screen). Morris et al. do not teach performing an action if a drag speed threshold is breached while dragging. Belfiore et al. teach performing an action if a drag speed threshold is breached while dragging (see Belfiore et al., column 3, lines 45 – 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2174

invention to incorporate the methods of Johnston et al. and Belfiore et al. with the method of Morris et al. and Savitzky in order to provide an improved method of providing visual feedback when a threshold is breached.

Claims 5 – 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 further in view of Hirose, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,112.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). They do not teach the method wherein:

in step (b), when the file icon has moved to a position more than a predetermined distance apart from the corresponding reduced-size image, an icon return space is displayed at or in a proximity to the original display position of the file icon, at a predetermined fixed interval from the reduced-size image.

Hirose teaches when an icon is moved, an icon return space is displayed at or in a proximity to the original display position of the icon (see Hirose, figure 7, ref. 311 and 303 and column 4, lines 19 – 24; the examiner interprets the dotted line 311 as a return space as it is located at the original position of the file icon 303). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hirose with the method of Morris et al. and Savitzky in order to display the area in which an icon was originally located when the icon has been dragged and moved from its original location.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Morris et al., Sazvitzky and Hirose teach the method of claim 5 (see rejection above). Hirose further teaches in step (b), when the file icon is dropped in the icon return space, the file icon is moved back to its original display position without moving the associated reduced-size image (see Hirose, figure 7, ref. 311 and 303 and column 4, lines 19 – 24; it is inherent that when the icon is dropped in the return space it will be in its original position and no changes will occur because the return space is the original location of the icon).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Morris et al. Sazvitzky and Hirose teach the method of claim 5 (see rejection above). Hirose further teaches the method wherein the icon return space is formed in an outstanding pattern (see Hirose, figure 7, ref. 311 and 303 and column 4, lines 19 – 24; the examiner interprets a dotted line as an outstanding pattern).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Sazvitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). They do not teach the operation method for processing data files as set forth in claim 1, wherein:

the icon return space is displayed in a different manner than the file icon when the file icon has moved to a position at a predetermined position from an original position.

Hirose teaches wherein the icon return space is displayed in a different manner than the file icon when the file icon has moved to a position at a predetermined position

Art Unit: 2174

from an original position (see Hirose, figure 7, ref. 311 and 303 and column 4, lines 19 – 24; the examiner interprets the dotted line 311 as a return space as it is located at the original position of the file icon 303). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hirose with the method of Morris et al. and Savitzky in order to clearly display the area in which an icon was originally located when the icon has been dragged and moved from its original location.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 in view of Hirose, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,112 further in view of Aparicio, IV et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,727,174.

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 5, Morris et al. Savitzky and Hirose teach the method of claim 5 (see rejection above). They do not teach displaying an icon return space. Hirose teaches displaying an icon return space but do not teach wherein the icon return space is larger in size than the icon. Aparicio, IV et al. teach a method wherein an icon return space is larger in size than the file icon (see Aparicio, IV, figure 6, items 47, and 49; the examiner interprets the empty mini-desk icon area as the return space, it is inherent that the assistant icon is smaller in size than the return space). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Aparicio, IV et al. with the method of Morris et al. Savitzky

Art Unit: 2174

and Hirose in order to provide a clearer indication to the user of the original location of an icon.

Claims 9, 13, 14 and 20 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 further in view of Johnston, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,598,524.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). They do not teach the operation method for processing data files as set forth in claim 1, wherein:

a function icon is displayed with substantially the same size as the file icon when the file icon is displayed.

Johnston, Jr. et al. teaches wherein a function icon is displayed with substantially the same size as the file icon when the file icon is displayed (see Johnston, Jr. et al., figures 9a – 9d, items 905 and 920). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Johnston, Jr. et al. with the method of Morris et al. and Savitzky in order to provide a consistent look for a graphical user interface.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Morris et al. and Savitzky teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). They do not teach the operation method for processing data files as set forth in claim 1, wherein:

a display of one or both of a function icon and an icon return space is changed when the file icon overlaps the function icon when the file icon is dragged.

Johnston, Jr. et al. teaches a display of one or both of a function icon and an icon return space is changed when the file icon overlaps the function icon when the file icon is dragged (see Johnston, Jr. et al., figure 17, item 1704 and column 14, lines 45 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Johnston, Jr. et al. with the method of Morris et al. and Savitzky in order to provide positive drag destination feedback to a user.

As per claim 13, Morris et al. teach a method, comprising:

generating a display that comprises a reduced-size image/file icon pair for each of one or more data files, wherein the reduced-sizes image permits an identification of the contents of the data file and the file icon is smaller than, and spaced from, the reduced-sized image (see Morris et al., figure 12B, items 809 and 807, column 6, lines 19 – 33, and column 15, lines 33 – 44; the examiner interprets the icons displayed in the thumbnail display as file icons and the scaled image as the reduced-size image); and

moving the reduced-sized image from an original display position in response to user inputs supplied via an input device for moving the file icon from an original display

Art Unit: 2174

position to another display position (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 67, and column 14, lines 1 – 11).

Morris et al. do not teach processing the data file in accordance with a function in response to user inputs supplied via the input device for moving the file icon from an original display position to a function invoking position on the display that invokes the function. Johnston, Jr. et al. teach processing a data file in accordance with a function in response to user inputs supplied via the input device for moving a file icon from an original display position to a function invoking position on the display that invokes the function (see Johnston, Jr. et al., column 12, lines 12 – 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Johnston, Jr. et al. with the method of Morris et al. in order to provide an improved method of accessing a commonly used function.

However they both fail to teach displaying the icon concurrently with the reduced image wherein the display position of the file icon relative to the display position of the reduced-size image is predetermined to be the same for each of the reduced-size image/file icon pairs;

Savitzky et al. teaches displaying the icon concurrently with the reduced image wherein the display position of the file icon relative to the display position of the reduced-size image is predetermined to be the same for each of the reduced-size image/file icon pairs (see Savitzky figure 3, items 306 and 308, column 3, lines 10-20; Examiner interprets a caption to be a icon because a user can click on one of the captions to perform an action) ;

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Savitzky's teaching with the method of Morris and Johnston, Jr. in order to simplify presentation and selection of images over the web.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 13 (see rejection above). Morris et al. further teach the method according to claim 13, wherein the user inputs for moving the file icon from its original display position to another display position comprise inputs for dragging-and-dropping the file icon (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 36 – 40).

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 13, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 13 (see rejection above). Morris et al. does not teach the method according to claim 13, wherein the user inputs for moving the file icon to the function-invoking position comprise inputs for dragging and dropping the file icon onto one of one of more function icons. Johnston, Jr. et al. teaches wherein the user inputs for moving the file icon to the function-invoking position comprise inputs for dragging and dropping the file icon onto one of one of more function icons (see Johnston, Jr. et al., column 12, lines 10 – 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Johnston, Jr. et al. with the method of Morris et al. in order to provide an improved method of accessing a commonly used function.

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 20 (see rejection above). Morris et al. does not teach the method according to claim 20, wherein the one or more function icons have substantially the same size as the file icons. Johnston, Jr. et al. teaches wherein the one or more function icons have substantially the same size as the file icons (see Johnston, Jr. et al., figures 9a – 9d, items 905 and 920). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Johnston, Jr. et al. with the method of Morris et al. in order to provide a consistent look for a graphical user interface.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 20, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 20 (see rejection above). Morris et al. further teach the method according to claim 20, wherein the file icon is disposed relative to the reduced-size image so that the file icon is between, the function icons and the reduced-sized image (see Morris et al., figure 12b, items 804, 807 and 809).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 13, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 13 (see rejection above). Morris et al. does not teach the method according to claim 13, wherein the function in accordance with which the data file is processed is selected from the group consisting of a printing function, a facsimile function, and an e-mail function. Johnston, Jr. et al. teaches

Art Unit: 2174

wherein the function in accordance with which the data file is processed is selected from the group consisting of a printing function, a facsimile function, and an e-mail function (see Johnston, Jr. et al., column 12, lines 28 – 34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Johnston, Jr. et al. with the method of Morris et al. Savitzky in order to provide a consistent look for a graphical user interface.

As per claims 24 and 25, they are of similar scope to claim 13 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 in view of Johnston, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,598,524 further in view of Fleming, U.S. Patent No. 5,392,389.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 14 (see rejection above). They do not teach the method according to claim 14, wherein the reduced-size image is moved from its original position to a position adjacent to the position at which the file icon is dropped. Fleming teaches wherein a reduced-size image is moved from its original position to a position adjacent to the position at which the file icon is dropped (see Fleming, figures 4,

Art Unit: 2174

5 and 6, items 27 and 29, and column 3, line 62 – column 4, line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Fleming with the method of Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. in order to provide a clear indication of a move operation to the user.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 in view of Johnston, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,598,524 further in view of Hirose, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,112.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 13, Morris et al. in view of Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 13 (see rejection above). They do not teach the method according to claim 13, further comprising:

displaying a file icon return space when the file icon is moved more than a predetermined distance from the reduced-size image.

Hirose teaches displaying a file icon return space when the file icon is moved more than a predetermined distance from the reduced-size image (see Hirose, figure 7, ref. 311 and 303 and column 4, lines 19 – 24; the examiner interprets the dotted line 303 as a return space as it is located at the original position of the file icon 303). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Hirose with the method of Morris et al. Savitzky and

Art Unit: 2174

Johnston, Jr. et al. in order to display the area in which an icon was originally located when the icon has been dragged and moved from its original location.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Morris et al. Savitzky et al., Johnston, Jr. et al. and Hirose teach the method of claim 16 (see rejection above). Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. do not teach the method according to claim 16, further comprising:

returning the file icon back to its original display position if the file icon is moved to the file icon return space.

Hirose teaches returning the file icon back to its original display position if the file icon is moved to the file icon return space (see Hirose, figure 7, ref. 311 and 303 and column 4, lines 19 – 24; it is inherent that when the icon is dropped in the return space it will be in its original position and no changes will occur because the return space is the original location of the icon).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 in view of Johnston, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,598,524 further in view of Hirose, U.S. Patent No. 5,745,112 further in view of Aparicio, IV et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,727,174.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 16, Morris et al., Savitzky, Johnston, Jr. et al. and Hirose teach the method of claim 16 (see rejection above). Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. do not teach the method according to claim 16, wherein the file icon return space has a larger area than the file icon. Hirose teaches displaying an icon return space but does not teach wherein file icon return space has a larger area than the file icon. Aparicio, IV et al. teach a method wherein the file icon return space has a larger area than the file icon (see Aparicio, IV, figure 6, items 47, and 49; the examiner interprets the empty mini-desk icon area as the return space, it is inherent that the assistant icon is smaller in size than the return space). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Aparicio, IV et al. with the method of Morris et al., Savitzky, Johnston, Jr. et al. and Hirose in order to provide a more clear indication to the user of the original location of an icon.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,097,389 in view of Savitzky et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,571,271 in view of Johnston, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,598,524 further in view of Belfiore et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,611,060.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 13, Morris et al. Savitzky and Johnston, Jr. et al. teach the method of claim 13 (see rejection above). Morris et al.

Art Unit: 2174

teach moving a reduced-size image in response to user input of moving the file icon (see rejection for claim 13). Morris et al. further teach indicating a move operation by a visual change (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 62).

Morris et al. and Savitzky do not teach representing the reduced-size image with a frame while moving the file icon. Johnston, Jr. et al. teach displaying a frame of a display object as it is dragged (see Johnston, Jr. et al., figures 13a, items 1300 and 1310 and column 13, lines 25 – 33).

Morris et al. teach performing an action when a threshold is breached during a drag operation (see Morris et al., column 13, lines 37 – 62; the display order is changed when the thumbnail is dragged onto a different part of the screen). Morris et al. do not teach performing an action if a movement speed is below a predetermined speed and not performing an action when the movement speed is above a predetermined speed. Belfiore et al. teach performing an action if a drag speed is below a predetermined speed and not performing an action if a drag speed is above a predetermined speed (see Belfiore et al., column 3, lines 45 – 60; it is inherent that the automatic scrolling will not be initiated when the speed is above a predetermined speed threshold).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the methods of Johnston et al. and Belfiore et al. with the method of Morris et al. and Savitzky in order to provide improved visual feedback when a threshold is breached.

Response to Argument

Art Unit: 2174

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
K. L. KINCAID
SUPERVISOR
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100